

REMARKS:

The Office Action dated September 20, 2007, and the Advisory Action dated January 8, 2008, have been carefully considered. In response thereto, the following remarks have been prepared, which are intended to be fully responsive to the Office Action and Advisory Action.

Summary of the Office Action, Advisory Action, and Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3, and 6-8 are pending in the application. None of the pending claims have been cancelled in this paper, and no new claims have been added. Thus, upon entry of this paper in the record, claims 1, 3, and 6-8 will be pending. The Advisory Action indicates that the claim amendments submitted with the Amendment After Final Rejection dated December 19, 2007, were entered in the record.

In the Office Action, the claims of record prior to December 19, 2007, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,195,835 to *Song et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,557,399 to *Wolf* and Japanese patent reference JP9-164100.

In the Advisory Action, the claims as amended December 19, 2007, were again rejected for the same reasons set forth in the Office Action, but also because the claimed relocation of the cyclone dust collector of *Song* in view of *Wolf* and JP9-164100 would, according to the Examiner, “be a matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art because the dust collector would be moved further up a conduit that is already fluidly connected thereto. Therefore, the change would be a change of location rather than function.” Claim 1 was further rejected because “the cyclone” lacks proper antecedent basis.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The rejection of the claims under § 103(a) is respectfully traversed because the location of the claimed cyclone dust collector on the handle tube is more than merely a design choice, but has the advantages as set forth in the specification.

Moreover, the prior art do not, by themselves or in combination with each other, disclose a cyclone dust collector and handle tube with a double-bent construction “wherein the cyclone dust collector is mounted under a portion of the double-bent construction and parallel to the double bent portion of the handle,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are not obvious in view of the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Antecedent Basis Rejection

Claim 1 was amended to clarify that the recited cyclone in the last “wherein” clause is the previously recited “cyclone dust collector” in claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 are respectfully requested.